



CJIS Executive Committee Meeting

Thursday, August 14, 2008 1:00pm – 3:00 pm
State Capitol – Ft. Totten Room, Bismarck, ND

Executive Committee Members Present:

Daryl Vance - Chief of Police Association
Sally Holewa - North Dakota Judicial Branch
Jerry Kemmet - North Dakota Attorney General's Office
Charles Placek - Department of Corrections
Dave Kleppe - Highway Patrol
Glen Ellingsberg - North Dakota Sheriffs & Deputies Association
Nancy Walz - Information Technology Department
Greg Wilz - Division of Emergency Management
Julie Lawyer - North Dakota State's Attorney Association

Others Present:

Gordon Christensen, Amy Vorachek, Pam Schafer, Sue Davenport, Cher Thomas, Lisa Feldner

Not Present:

Keith Witt - Chief of Police Association
Kelly Janke - North Dakota Sheriffs & Deputies Association

❖ Approve Meeting Minutes

- Glen motions to approve, Darrel seconds, minutes approved

❖ SAVIN Program Update – Amy Vorachek

- Amy emailed the project plan and brought copies. The plan is currently a rough draft to give an idea what will happen over the next couple years. The SAVIN project falls within Large Project Oversight (LPO) administration. The LPO analyst reviewed the draft and recommended there needs to be additional vendor input and assumptions and constraints need to be overhauled in the plan. Some of the deliverables have been completed. LPO saw the issues with the Courts project timing. Amy stated we are leaving the Courts in the plan. Amy spoke with the grant manager and they are willing to be flexible with us. In April of 2010, we can apply for a grant extension if needed. Another option is changing the scope if it comes to that, later on in the process. Also, the vendor is flexible has left the Courts in as optional module. The plan's milestones need to be further identified. Team directory will mostly stay the same. Explaining all the Boards will need to be done. Page 19 has the schedule and dates may change but the process will remain the same in the two year project time frame. The cash flow analysis will change. Amy is working on site operation costs, if we have a site down for a while, we do not want to pay for it. The organizational chart will be modified. Chuck asked Amy about the Judiciary Committee meeting. Amy explained that measures were brought before the Council on Thursday. The Judiciary Committee changed some of the language so SAVIN would be responsible for notifications. Section 6 dealt with SAVIN. Linda from ND-CAWS provided testimony. She was afraid victims would lose their right if they didn't register, the way it was written. We do want victims to register. Linda's

resolution was for those victims that don't want to register maybe could have the agency register for them. Liability was brought up. It was suggested to have the agency be responsible for those who do not want to register. If the agency still has to notify, we would be performing duplicate services and this is not where we are trying to go. SAVIN has the ability to do it. If the victim comes to the agency, a third party would be able to register them. The discussion included victims taking responsibility to register for notification. For the agencies who notified victims before, that information needs to be transferred to SAVIN and victims need to know the registration process. Chuck sees it that all agencies covered under this; their responsibility is to provide information about notification. There will be tools available such as pamphlets, posters and other marketing information provided by Appriss. There still has to be responsibility on the victim, otherwise, why are we doing it? It is still on the agency to notify. Amy feels good how things ended and the bill will still need revisions. I'm sure other states have had the same concerns. We should contact those states for their input. Amy has several emails out to other states. It was recommended to have a representative from another state to give their opinion. In current law the requirement of notification is the responsibility of the agency. Problems come in when we do not always know where the victim is or have any way to reach them. This puts the responsibility on the victim. Sally recommends that we show the advantages to the victim in self registration. SAVIN allows anyone to register for notification, not only victims, but neighbors or friends. Pam will send the revised bill draft to the committee.

❖ **CJIS Project Status Report – Gordon Christensen**

- Portal 2.0 continuing mostly as expected. We've had a few scope changes. Those included an \$8000 scope change to add LERMS and a savings of \$50,000 for the use of ITD programmers versus contractors. The project is on schedule.
- Bismarck PD, ready to go as soon as we finish the CJIS Portal.
- Cruiser, done with installation in many places already in the last 3 or 4 weeks. Nelson has been using it successfully. We haven't had much feedback from the others. We will leave this out for a month or so then more counties will be added
- VPN changes: Gordon is continuing with the study of VPN. ITD is working on an alternative tool to VPN and we plan to pursue that opportunity if possible.
- Disposition Study, Judy at BCI met with Gordon. We are getting closer to an automated interface. They are collecting data as this point on JustWare. Mid September we should have some results from the information gathered.

❖ **Administrative Rules – Pam Schafer, Chuck Placek**

- All have a copy. The administrative rules were sent through email. Pam reviewed with the committee. Questions answered: #3- We gave the state capitol address because that is where CJIS mail goes to. Chapter 110-01-02: administrative rules: some of this language is straight from the Century code. We were told to take the statute and fit it to us. Pam made some changes to grammatical errors. The next step is to have the CJIS Board accept the document and follow the procedures of rule making.

❖ **State Radio Current Events – Greg Wilz**

- The State Radio's CAD RFP has been out for a couple of weeks. We are guessing we'll have enough money to buy a barebones model. We are submitting a request for phase 2 of the CAD for about 2 million. We are looking at a system that will be web-based where agencies can look online to see where their vehicles are. Second part will help officers in the field instantly manage additional support on the field such as a wrecker or others. Also, mobile CADD which gets loaded on the machine in the car. The 3rd part is a records management piece, not sure if we want to look at that. We are also asking for

additional 8 radio towers to cover the many voids that we have. 3 are DOT existing towers. If we get those towers, our intention is not to equip them with the mobile data side. We are stuck with this system until air cards and wideband technology can be used across the state. The CAD is one new piece of technology. Another thing is to upgrade our dispatching software. That will allow us to become interoperable with others and have a backup. We are asking for money for a new state map and replace the existing mapping they are using. We have the technology in the state to do this. We can now do this project at a much lower cost and higher accuracy. CAD and dispatching software both require mapping. The AVL system, are they going to build that into the air cards? Greg it will have to be through the air card technology. Is there much overlap between the LERMS users on CJIS? Dave does not know the answer to that. Chuck thinks we would have overlap.

❖ **IJIS Study Review – Pam Schafer**

- Copies were provided. The CJIS Board has reviewed the document. Greg Wilz also made some suggestions. Pam submitted his concerns to IJIS. Chuck noted it is a lengthy report and would suggest members take the time to read through it. The base of the study was to check strengths and weaknesses as well as overlap. This is a draft that went back and IJIS will send their response. When we get the report back, how is the state going to handle the recommendation? Lisa said our next steps are having a subcommittee look at what we have in place on both sides and report back to her so she can report back to this committee. Things need to be aligned. Chuck noticed the report touches on governance issues. Suggestions should be sent to Pam.

❖ **NICS Improvement Amendment Act of 2007 – Sally Holewa**

- Looking at the things that are required, we are going to have to separate some data. What does the AG's office already have? It says it has to be modified information. We already do some of this but not all. In order to get to that start date. The AG's is going to have to show that 90% is available. If we need to do this, how do we proceed? Cher, AG's is not currently working on this. It is hard to tell when they are in different categories. Jerry, we are working on this. We are working on the mental health adjudications. We cannot provide this unless state law is changed. Darrel, a lot of times when they do a mixed check, they put a hold on the sale and they have 10 days to give them an answer. This is on the federal end. Jerry, mental health issues and indictments are an issue. Protection orders are not going to the Feds right now. How do we distinguish between the domestic violence related or not? We have to add a note to it. Sally, the court is ready to go forward but format is a problem. With the limited amounts of funding this affected, it was determined to be dropped.
- ND is the only state that didn't get funding for Adam Walsh Act.

❖ **Legislative Drafting for CJIS – Pam Schafer and Nancy Walz**

- Copies given. This was presented to the CJIS board and they have made some changes and suggestions. Reorganization was suggested. Member's titles and definitions are given for the governance committee board.
- Sally asked if this would be duplicating this committee or would this committee be dissolved. Nancy, the two would combine to have only one governance structure – the CJIS Board. Chuck, page 2, the diagram shows the organizational structure. Jerry, it would take care of some of the questions we've had at this level regarding our function as a group. Combining will accomplish what is good for the state. Do we need more than one police rep and 1 sheriff rep? Darrel, 1 rep from small and 1 from large should be fine. Nancy, the discussion at the board meeting was having 11 people on the board. We don't want to exclude input from any of those areas. They will still have a voice if

they are not on the board through special committees. Glen, I agree with Jerry that combining the boards is efficient. IJIS recommends those who collected data, be involved. DOT is so important to law enforcement. It is recommended DOT be part of the board. Greg also thinks keeping the board small is important. What is the point of the one-at-large member? Nancy stated most committees have this in there in case the Governor wants to add someone. Also if we are focused on different topics, there is the ability to have someone from an appropriate department. Glen believes we need it to be a sufficient size to accommodate absences.

➤ We will take this to the board and they will create a bill draft.

❖ **Greg motions to adjourn. Dave seconds. Meeting adjourned at 2:33 PM.**